



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,667	12/26/2000	Katsuyuki Matsumoto	001716	1951

7590 08/18/2003

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,
MCLELAND & NAUGHTON, LLP
1725 K Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20006

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

KASENGE, CHARLES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2125	6

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/745,667	MATSUMOTO, KATSUYUKI
Examiner	Art Unit	
Charles R Kasenge	2125	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/9/03.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . 6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed June 9, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Shimazaki does implicitly disclose the internal power source being lower in voltage than the external power source. Shimazaki discloses the internal power source being a battery (col. 4, lines 45-50) and the external power source being an electrical outlet (col. 3, lines 16-18). Inherently it is known the external power source is 120 Volts AC, and the internal power source is much lower than that (usually around 3.7 Volts). Therefore, Shimazaki discloses the internal power source being lower in voltage than the external power source.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimazaki U.S. Patent 6,338,143. Referring to claim 1, Shimazaki discloses a portable electronic device (col. 2, lines 43-45) comprising a power source terminal for connecting to an external power source, an internal power source which is lower in voltage than the external power source (col. 2, lines 1-10), first circuit means to execute first data processing, and second circuit means to execute second data processing which has lower speed than the first data processing (col. 4, lines 31-52), wherein the external power source supplies power to the device through a power source terminal when the first circuit means is in an active mode, and the internal power source supplies power to the device when the second circuit means is in the active mode (col. 2, lines 1-10).

Shimazaki discloses the internal power source being a dry battery or a secondary battery (col. 1, lines 65-67), the portable electronic device having a USB connector conforming to the Universal Serial Bus standard, and one terminal of the USB connector provides the power source terminal (col. 3, lines 19-22).

Shimazaki discloses the first circuit means is provided by a data communication controller to execute predetermined data communication processing for performing data communication with an external information processing device (col. 3, lines 19-27 and col. 4, lines 8-10), and the second circuit means is provided by a control circuit to execute device operation processing for usual operation of the device (col. 6, lines 31-34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimazaki as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Morgan U.S. Patent 5,764,502. Shimazaki discloses interconnected power supplying wires extending from external and internal power sources (Fig. 3). The office also interprets power-supplying wires as inherent to a portable electronic device having internal and external power sources. Shimazaki does not expressly disclose using a reverse flow resist means for two power supplying wires. Morgan discloses power supplying wires extending from a power source and having a reverse flow resist means (col. 15, lines 13-37).

At the time this invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Morgan's reverse flow resist means for Shimazaki's power supplying wires. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since it is commonly known to use a reverse flow resist means for a power supplying wire in order to protect from overloading the power source.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles R Kasenge whose telephone number is 703 305-8592. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on 703 308-0538. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 746-7239 for regular communications and 703 746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-0538.

CK
August 14, 2003



LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100